Michigan Department of Agriculture
Food Service Sanitation Program
Section III
Accreditation Findings Summary
March 6 through December 18, 2006 (Cycle 3, Year 1)
13 Departments Evaluated

Introduction:

The purpose of this summary is to report the significant findings and trends noted during the past thirteen food service sanitation program reviews. The information can be used by MDA to show program areas that may need clarification, training, and increased focus. Local health departments can use the summary when conducting self-assessments, writing "Moot Point Principle" memorandum, and as part of the over-all quality improvement process.

I. General Statistics

Average Number of Indicators Met (20 total):	18.5
Highest Number of Indicators Met	20
Lowest Number of Indicators Met	16
Average Number of Important Factors Met (6 total)	3.1
Highest Number of Important Factors Met	5
Lowest Number of Important Factors Met	1
Average Met with Conditions per Department	2.3
Average Number Special Recognitions* (20 possible)	10
Highest Number of Special Recognitions	15
Lowest Number Special Recognitions	5
Best Practices (offered by local health to MDA)	4

*given for 90+% indicator compliance and/or when an indicator that was Not Met in Cycle 1 is now Met

II. Trends in Compliance Over Time

	Indicators Met		
Review Periods	**Range**	**Average**	**%**
10 Reviews from February - June, 2004	11-20	16	76%
10 Reviews from July - November 2004	13-21	17	81%
12 Reviews from December, 2004 – August 2005	16-21	19.3	92%
13 Reviews from March-December, 2006	16-20	18.5	93%

III. Top 10 Most Successful Indicators

Indicator	**% Met**
4 - Vending Machine Locations	100
5 - Temporary Food Service Establishment Insp.	100
7 - Identification of Critical Violations- field	100
9 - Records	100
12 - New Construction (field)	100
14 - Variances	100
15 - Complaints	100
17 - Fixed Food Service Inspection Skills	100
18 - Specialty Food Service Inspection Skills	100
3 - Inspection Frequency	92

IV.   Top Problem Indicators

Indicator	% Met
20 - Foodborne Illness Investigation Procedures	54
8 - Inspections Result in Food Code Compliant Establishments (field)*	85
1 - Plan Review	85
2 - Pre-opening Inspections	85

* Eleven(11) of thirteen(13) LHDs received a met.   Nine (9) of those eleven (11) classified as "Met" actually received " Met with Conditions".

V.   MPR / Indicator Compliance Overview

1   Plan Review: 85% Compliance (11 out of 13. Includes 2 departments receiving Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: Not obtaining complete sets of plans (applications, scaled drawings, menus, equipment specifications, plumbing plan, plan review worksheet, lighting info). Records lack plan review checklists and calculations.

2.   Pre-Opening Inspections: 85% Compliance (11 out of 13) Includes 1 department receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: Documentation of approval to open, opening with a critical violation.

3.   Inspection Frequency: 92 % Compliance (12 out of 13).
Common Problems: None

4.   Vending Machine Locations: 100% Compliance (13 out of 13)
Common Problems: None

5.   Temporary Food Service Establishment Inspections: 100% Compliance
(13 out of 13).
Common Problems: None

6.   Inspection Procedures: 92% Compliance (12 out of 13. Includes 2 departments receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: Not properly documenting critical and non-critical violations, reports do not convey a clear message.

7.   Identification of Critical Violations (field): 100% Compliance (13 out of 13. Includes 1 department receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: None.

8.   Inspections Result in Food Code Compliant Establishments (field): 85%
Compliance (11 out of 13. Includes 9 departments receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: See section VII, Detailed Summary.

9.   Records: 100% Compliance (13 out of 13. Includes 3 departments receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: Seasonal dates were missing, applications and files were missing.

10. Enforcement Policy: 92% Compliance (12 out of 13).
Common Problems: None

11. Unauthorized Construction: 92% Compliance (12 out of 13. Includes 4 departments receiving a Met w/Conditions)
Common Problems: Failure to prevent construction from occurring prior to plan review and approval.

12. New Construction (field): 100% Compliance
Common Problems: None

13. License Limitations: 92% Compliance (12 out of 13 including 1 department receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: None.

14. Variances: 100% Compliance (13 out of 13):
Common Problems: None.

15. Consumer Complaint Investigations: 100% Compliance (13 out of 13):
Common Problems: None

16. Technical Training: 92% Compliance (12 out of 13)
Common Problems: None

17. Fixed Food Service Inspection Skills: 100% Compliance (13 out of 13).
Common Problems: None.

18. Specialty Food Service Inspection Skills: 100% Compliance (13 out of 13).
Common Problems: None

19. Foodborne Illness Timely Response: 92% Compliance (12 out of 13 including 1 department receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: None.

20. Foodborne Illness Procedures: 54% Compliance (7 out of 13,including 2 departments receiving a Met w/Conditions):
Common Problems: Forms A and/or C1, C2 (or equivalent) were missing, departments were not documenting timely log reviews for trend detection, and written policies were found to be incomplete.

VI.   Important Factor Review:

Important Factors	% Met
Important Factor I – Educational Outreach	100
Important Factor II – Follow-Up inspections **(Formerly HACCP)**	85
Important Factor III – Continuing Education for Regulatory Staff	77
Important Factor IV – Program Support	23
Important Factor V – Industry and Community Relations	15
Important Factor VI – Quality Assurance Program	8

VII.   Indicator 8 Details

The indicator is judged to be Met when no violation category on MPR Table 8 is marked more than 40% of the time by MDA. Fifteen percent of the departments included in this summary did not pass indicator 8. Of the 85% of departments that passed, 69% of those passed with a Met with Conditions.

MPR Table 8 Violation Category	% of the departments evaluated having the violation category marked by MDA more than 40% of the time
Physical facility	54
Equipment – Nonfood Contact	46
Date Marking	31
Plumbing / Cross-Connections	31
Time / Temperature	8

Common Problems:

Plumbing / Cross-Connections: Most of the violations found in this category relate to air-breaks and air-gaps on waste lines. The waste lines are either directly connected or are connected via an air-break where an air-gap is required. Also, pressure nozzles were found downstream of Atmospheric Vacuum Breakers, or had no protection at all.

Date Marking: Failure to date mark potentially hazardous refrigerated ready-to-eat food. Using the date of preparation rather than the consume-by date.   Using 8 days.

Time / temperature: Failure to cool food properly. Failure to reheat food properly.   Improper hot holding temperatures.   Underlying reason for the chronic violation may be failure to ask proper questions during the inspection to detect improper time/temperature related procedures (risk based inspection).

Equipment – Non Food Contact: Soiled equipment. Lack of air drying, lack of chemical test strips, improper storage of in-use utensils, equipment is in poor repair.

Physical Facility: Cleaning of the floors, walls, ceilings. Lack of mop sinks. Repairs needed for floors, ceilings, and outer openings.